

REMARKS

Claims 4-16 are pending in the application. Claims 1-3 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein.

Claim Objections

Claims 12-13 have been objected to because of antecedent basis problems.

Claims 12-13 have been amended, without narrowing the scope thereof, to overcome these objections. Therefore, the scope of the amended claims should not be construed as being limited to the literal language of the claims. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw these objections.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph because the limitation of having an "inspection means side" in line 4 is unclear.

Claim 6 has been amended, without narrowing the scope thereof, to overcome this rejection. Therefore, the scope of this claim should not be construed as being limited to the literal language of the claim.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 4-10 and 12-14 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Rather than amending claim 4 to include all of the limitations recited in claims 2 and 3, claim 4 has been amended into independent claim form to include all of the limitations recited in claim 1 to place it in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 4 is allowable because none of the prior art of record discloses or even suggests that the "working position is inside said frame and said maintenance position is outside said frame," as recited therein. This is also acknowledged by the Examiner in page 4 of the Office Action.

Claim 5 has been amended to include all of the limitations recited in claim 1 to place it in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 5 is allowable because none of the prior art of record discloses or even suggests that the inspection moving means includes "a rotatably provided support roller, and a guide for guiding between said working position and said maintenance position of said inspection means," as recited therein. This is also acknowledged by the Examiner in page 4 of the Office Action.

Claims 6-10, variously dependent upon claim 5, are allowable at least for their dependency upon claim 5.

Claim 12 has been amended to include all of the limitations recited in claims 1 and 11, as filed, to place it in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 12 is allowable because none of the prior art of record discloses or even suggest that the "corrector moving means includes a roller provided at said correcting means, and a guide provided inside of said frame for guiding the moving of said correcting means," as recited therein. This is also acknowledged by the Examiner in page 4 of the Office Action.

Claims 13 and 14, variously dependent upon claim 12, are allowable at least for their dependency upon claim 12.

A favorable determination by the Examiner and allowance of the foregoing claims is earnestly solicited.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 11, 15, and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kouichi (Publication 06-238867). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-3 have been canceled.

Claim 11 has been amended to include all of the limitations recited in claim 2 and also that the working position is "a

position in which said correcting means is inside the frame" and the maintenance position is "a position in which said correcting means is outside the frame."

Claim 11 is now in condition for allowance because, as that Examiner has stated with respect to claim 4 in page 3 of the Office Action, none of the prior art of record, including Kouichi, discloses or even suggest such a feature.

Claim 15, as amended to depend upon claim 11, is allowable at least for its dependency upon claim 11.

Claim 16, dependent on claim 15, is allowable at least for its dependency upon claim 15.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this art grounds of rejection.

Request for Initialed Form(s) PTO-1449

In reviewing the application file, the undersigned has noted that the appropriate initialed Form PTO-1449 in response to the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed on March 6, 2002 has not been received by Applicant. The Examiner is therefore requested to return a copy of the initialed Form PTO-1449 to the undersigned as soon as possible.

Conclusion

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and objections, and allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Maki Hatsumi (Reg. No. 40,417) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
for Terrell C. Birch, #19,382 (reg. # 40,417)

TCB:MH/mh:pjh
0965-0372P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000